

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated April 12, 2007 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Applicants appreciate and thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives during the September 26 personal interview. The substance of the interview is incorporated into the remarks below and constitutes a record of the interview.

By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-22 and 27 have been amended. Support for the amendment to the independent claims 1, 22 and 27 can be found, for example, at Figs. 3 and 4 and in the specification at pages 7-9. Re-examination and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-3, 5-22 and 27 have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3, 5-21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3, 5-21 have been amended to obviate the rejection. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-3 and 5-21 under 35 §103(a) as being obvious over "PROGRAM AND SYSTEM INFORMATION PROTOCOL FOR TERRESTRIAL BROADCAST AND CABLE" (hereafter referred to as "*Doc. A/65*") in view of WO 99/20049 to Ozkan et al. (hereinafter "*Ozkan*") and U.S. Patent No. 6,526,577 to Knudson et al. (hereinafter "*Knudson*"). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, among other features, information type identification field that contains a code specifying a data type of a logo graphic to be displayed on a display screen...the information type descriptor includes an information description field that contains description data associated with the data type of the logo graphic. Office Action at page 6 acknowledges that *Doc. A/65* fails to disclose "data type of information is data type of a logo graphic to be displayed..." Then, it must follow that *Doc. A/65* cannot also disclose or suggest a code specifying a data type of a logo graphic, as recited in claim 1.

Nevertheless, the Office Action also makes reference to page 14, section 6.1 - page 42, section 6.8 of *Doc. A/65* asserting that these sections describe an information descriptor including information type identification field that contains a code specifying a data type of information associated with content/data to be displayed on the screen. Applicants respectfully submit that these sections merely describe the tables of the PSIP information. Specifically, they define virtual channels and content ratings, as well as program guides with titles and description to be decoded and displayed by a receiver.

The application has addressed this issue in that using only the teaching of the *Doc. A/65*, the electronic program guide (EPG) that is generated will only provide textual descriptions of the events and ratings, among other things, that are not visually compelling. See pages 1-2 of the specification. The claimed invention resolves this problem through logo graphics which the Office Action has acknowledged is not taught nor suggested by *Doc. A/65*.

Likewise, the Office Action acknowledges at page 8 that *Ozkan* fails to disclose data type of logo graphic to be displayed on the display screen. However, the Office Action at the same page alleges that *Knudson* discloses this feature. On the contrary., although *Knudson* may disclose a graphic logo, *Knudson* clearly fails to disclose or suggest “a code specifying a data type of a logo graphic to be displayed on a display screen.” Furthermore, Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion made at page 8 of the Office Action that *Knudson* inherently contain code specifying a data type of a logo graphic to be displayed. Specifically, the logo 519 as shown in Figs. 9-19 can be generated without having any code identifying the data type of the logo 519. Thus, it would be unreasonable to conclude that the program guide data *inherently* contains code specifying a data type of a logo graphic merely because the program guide screen contains the logo graphic 519.

Moreover, claim 1 further recites displaying the logo graphic in an Electronic Program Guide (EPG) using at least one of the data type of the logo graphic and the description data associated with the data type of the logo graphic. Obviously, both the *Doc. A/65* and *Ozkan* cannot disclose this feature because, as acknowledged in the Office Action, both the *Doc. A/65* and *Ozkan* fail to disclose data type of logo graphic to be displayed on the display screen. As discussed above, since it is unreasonable to assert that it would be inherent in *Knudson* contain

code specifying a data type of a logo graphic to be displayed, and *Knudson* does not expressly nor implicitly disclose displaying the logo graphic in an Electronic Program Guide (EPG) using at least one of the data type of the logo graphic and the description data associated with the data type of the logo graphic, it must follow that the combination of *Doc. A/65*, *Ozkan* and *Knudson* fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

Furthermore, nowhere in *Doc. A/65*, *Ozkan* or *Knudson* do they disclose or suggest the logo graphic is received from the DTV transmitter. *Doc. A/65* merely discloses the PSIP protocol, but as acknowledged by the Office Action, fails to disclose or suggest data type of logo graphic to be displayed on the display screen. *Ozkan*, as acknowledged by the Office Action, also fails to disclose or suggest data type of logo graphic to be displayed on the display screen. Thus, it must follow that both *Doc. A/65* and *Ozkan* would fail to disclose or suggest that the logo graphic is received from the DTV transmitter. *Knudson*, on the other hand, describes a logo graphic 519, but is silent as to where the logo graphic 519 originated from. Therefore, it must follow that the combination of *Doc. A/65*, *Ozkan* and *Knudson* fail to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1

Claims 2-3 and 5-21 are at least allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1. The Office Action rejects claims 22 and 27 under 35 §103(a) as being obvious over *Ozkan* in view of *Knudson*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22 and 27 recite similar features as claim 1, and thus is allowable over *Doc. A/65*, *Ozkan* and *Knudson* since these references fail to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 22 and 27 for at least the reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 1.

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

Dated: January 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
Mark R. Krelsoff

Registration No.: 42,766

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant